



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,577	04/26/2001	Robert James Lawson	13DV13821	7443
29399	7590	08/08/2006	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. BEULICK (12729) C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740			PHAM, HUNG Q	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2168		

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/842,577	LAWSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q. PHAM	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Election/Restrictions

- Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 12/20/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a thorough search and examination of either claim group would be relevant to the examination of the other group. This is not found persuasive because the invention of groups I and II are independent and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction was not required.

As indicated in the previous Action, group I is drawn to a method for providing access based on user profiles by creating user profile, electronic profile for data, establishing rule and method for accessing. Group II is drawn to a method of generating a database and the database comprises pre-established criteria, applications data including system administrator defined attributes, user data includes a user's organization and citizenship and predetermined rules and methodologies data. These two groups are independent the examiner has to do two different thorough search, one for a method for providing access based on user profiles, and one for a database comprises pre-established criteria, applications data including system administrator defined attributes, user data includes a user's organization and citizenship and predetermined rules and methodologies data.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

- This application contains claim 16 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper filed on 12/20/05. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered and are persuasive in view of the amendment. The rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been fully considered. The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been withdrawn in view of the withdrawal of claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

• Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants:

(a) At page 9:

... neither Kraenzel nor Behera, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method that includes automatically determining, using an internal exception access process an approval or a disapproval of quick access based on pre-established criteria and the list of data for approval.

(b) At page 11:

Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion in the Office Action at page 12, lines 18-20, that "[i]nstead of granting access as indicated at boxes 152-156, an internal exception access process is implemented at boxed 162-166 for quick approval." This assertion is in contrast with Kraenzel that describes that additional privileges are requested from a system administrator, which is the object author or manager and not an internal exception access process as recited in Claim I. Applicants respectfully submit that a system administrator can not fairly be considered an internal exception access process. For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Kraenzel in view of Behera.

Art Unit: 2168

(c) At page 11:

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent Claim I, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 3 and 4 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim I, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 3 and 4 are also patentable over Kraenzel in view of Behera.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

(a) As shown in FIG. 3 of Kraenzel, *if the user is denied access* indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests *prompting the user to select* is implied at this box. Instead of granting access as indicated at boxes 152-156, *an internal exception access process* is implemented at boxed 162-166 *for quick approval*. As disclosed at Col. 4, Lines 22-23, the request for access contains one or more objects requested by a user. Thus, the requested object as *a list of data for approval* is *included in the quick approval request* at box 162. Referring back to FIG. 3, the YES and NO branch of box 162 indicates the claimed limitation *automatically determining, using an internal exception access process, an approval or a disapproval of quick access*. As shown in box 166, the additional privileges of the requested objects are determined by the YES and NO branch of box 166. In different words, *an approval or a disapproval of quick access is determined based on pre-established criteria and the list of data for approval*.

(b) The *internal exception access process* as claimed is equated with the process at boxes 162-166, and is not in contrast with Kraenzel because the additional privileges are requested from a user, and granted by the system administrator.

(c) Claims 2-4 are also rejected with the reasons as discussed above.

Art Unit: 2168

- Applicants' arguments with respect Kraenzel in view of Behera from page 11 to page 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

- Applicants' arguments with respect Kraenzel in view of CERN and Lillibridge from page 12 to page 15 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as discussed above in view of claim 1.

- In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, CERN teaches an OHR application and Lillibridge teaches an RFCA Application (Lillibridge, Col. 8, lines 35-46). The user profile as taught by Kraenzel could be used to include the information available from either an Oracle Human Resource Application or a request for Computer Access Application.

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 5-14 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches *a method for managing a user profile information (Kraenzel, Abstract) including managing access control to applications and data by implementing a level of security across the different applications that is the same for each application* (Kraenzel, Col. 1, Lines 13-26) *using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least*

Art Unit: 2168

one client system (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system). The Kraenzel method comprises the steps of:

providing capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to (As shown in FIG. 3, after making an object request access at box 152 and if user privilege does not meet minimum requirement for object requested at box 156, additional privilege can be requested and processed by boxes 162-168);

tracking a status of the request using a tracking component coupled to the centralized interactive database (as illustrated at Kraenzel FIG. 3, after making a request access at box 152, *a status of the request*, either YES for retrieving object at box 158 or NO for requesting additional privileges at box 162, Col. 4, Lines 20-35, *is tracked by Access Determining Object 24*, Col. 3, Lines 5-7, as *a tracking component included in Profile System 14*. Access Determining Object 24 is *coupled to an ACL as centralized interactive database*, Col. 2, Lines 14-16);

obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested (additional privilege is determined by system administrator to have YES/NO branch, Col. 4, Lines 37-39);

Referring back to Kraenzel FIG. 3, user privilege is determined again at box 156, *if the user is denied access* indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests *prompting the user to complete the request for additional privileges as quick approval* is implied at this box. As disclosed at Col. 2, Lines 12-15 and Col. 4, Lines 22-23, the request for access contains one or more objects requested by a user, and the requested objects are files or documents. Thus, the requested objects contain at least keywords for identifying the request files or documents such as files names. In different words, *a list of the information the user is requesting access to for approval is included in the quick approval request at box 162*;

Art Unit: 2168

The YES and NO branches of box 162 as *an internal exception access process*, which indicate the steps of *automatically determining an approval or a disapproval of quick access*. The determination is based on additional privileges as *pre-established criteria* and the requested objects that contain information for identifying the request files or documents as the *list of the information the user is requesting access to*;

if the request for quick approval is approved, at least one of automatically adding a rule to the database and automatically adding a user to the database (if additional privileges have been granted, ACL is updated (Col. 4, Lines 38-39). User profile is added or updated in accordance with the updated ACL (Col. 3, Lines 3-5). A rule can be added to the user profile database (Col. 4, Lines 11-13). A new use profile could be added to the user profile database (Col. 3, Lines 1-42));

if the rule is added, updating an exception list (Col. 4, Lines 3-13); and

notifying the user of the approval (Col. 4, Lines 38-41).

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 15 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: *the database* at line 17 (*the centralized database* is respectfully suggested). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2168

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 1, the method of providing access to users does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result as set forth in MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii)¹. The claim limitation, after the step of *making a decision*, begins with “*if the user is denied access... if the request for quick approval is approved... if the rule is added...*” will not perform in the process when the conditional statement is not satisfied. In different words, “*if the user is approved*”, the method is stopped after “*making a decision*” step. Therefore, the claimed invention does not have a useful result because the request for access is not provided “*if the user is approved*”. The claimed invention does not produce a concrete and tangible result because the result from the approval condition is still unknown. The step of “*making a decision*” is not a concrete and tangible result because the result from the decision is unknown and not being used in the process.

Regarding claim 5, the method of providing access to users does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result as set forth in MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii). A *method for managing user profile information, including managing access control to applications... by implementing a level of security across the different applications that is the same for each application* was recited in the preamble, but there is no claim limitation illustrates the management of user profile information in the body of the claim.

¹ MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii):

For such subject matter to be statutory, the claimed process must be limited to a practical application of the abstract idea or mathematical algorithm in the technological arts. See *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1543, 31 USPQ2d at 1556-57 (quoting *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 192, 209 USPQ at 10). See also *Alappat* 33 F.3d at 1569, 31 USPQ2d at 1578-79 (Newman, J., concurring) (“unpatentability of the principle does not defeat patentability of its practical applications”) (citing *O’Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 114-19). A claim is limited to a practical application when the method, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. See *AT & T*, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. Likewise, a machine claim is statutory when the machine, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result (as in *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601) and/or when a specific machine is being claimed (as in *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557 (“> en< banc”). For example, a computer process that simply calculates a mathematical algorithm that models noise is nonstatutory. However, a claimed process for digitally filtering noise employing the mathematical algorithm is statutory.

Art Unit: 2168

Neither *applications*, nor *a level of security across the different applications that is the same for each application* is implemented. The claim limitation, after the step of *obtaining a decision*, begins with "*if the user is denied access... if the request for quick approval is approved... if the rule is added...*" will not perform in the process when the conditional statement is not satisfied. In different words, "if the user is approved", the method is stopped after "obtaining a decision" step. Therefore, the claimed invention does not have a useful result because the request for access is not provided "if the user is approved". The claimed invention does not produce a concrete and tangible result because the result from the approval condition is still unknown. The step of "*obtaining a decision*" is not a concrete and tangible result because the result from the decision is unknown and not being used in the process.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As in claim 1, the user in the step of notifying references to a plurality of users, e.g., one at line 5 and one at line 17. It is unclear what user is being referenced. The step of *adding a user to the database* makes the claim indefinite because one user is request for access, and another user is added to the database.

Art Unit: 2168

As in claim 5,

the request in the step of tracking a status references to a some other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced;

the data requested in the step of obtaining a decision references to a some other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced;

the quick access request in the step of automatically determining references to a some other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039].

Regarding claim 1, Kraenzel teaches *a method for providing access to users based on user profiles* (Kraenzel, Abstract) *and using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least one client system* (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system).

creating an electronic profile for a user within a centralized database (an electronic user profile is created by profile system 14 (Col. 3, Lines 1-2) within the profile system as a centralized database (Col. 2, Lines 50-56));

creating an electronic profile for data within the centralized database (Access Control List as electronic profile for data within the profile system as a centralized database (Col. 3, Lines 4-14));

establishing pre-determined rules and methodology for user access (inferencing rules as pre-determined rules and access privileges, e.g., read-only access, as methodology for user access are established (Col. 4, Lines 6-13));

making a decision with reference to the user access after completing an evaluation based on the electronic profiles, pre-determined rules, and operating methodology in response to a request from the user for access (As shown in FIG. 3, in order to grant access to a requested object or making a decision with reference to the user access, and the procedure is processed as at step 156-158, in response to a request from the user for access, to complete an evaluation based on inferencing rules to retrieve key words in the user profile and determine access privileges (Col. 4, Lines 6-11) for comparing with access privileges in ACL (Col. 4, Lines 22-26) as the electronic profiles, pre-determined rules, and operating methodology (Col. 4, Lines 25-31)).

In regard to the limitation if the user is denied access, prompting the user to complete the request for quick approval wherein the request for quick approval includes a list of data for approval; automatically determining, using an internal exception access process, an approval or a disapproval of quick access based on pre-established criteria and the list of data for approval; if the request for quick approval is approved, at least one of automatically adding a rule to the database and automatically adding a user to the database; if the rule is added, updating an exception list; and notifying the user of the approval, such limitation has been interpreted as a conditional statement wherein the steps following the conditional statement are only performed when the specified condition has been met. The steps are not performed when the condition has not been met. Therefore, the steps following the conditional statement have

Art Unit: 2168

been interpreted as being optional. Claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed (MEPE 2111.04).

In this case, when the access request is approved, the process of providing access is stopped after the step of making a decision.

Regarding claim 1, Kraenzel teaches *a method for providing access to users based on user profiles* (Kraenzel, Abstract) *and using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least one client system* (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system).

creating an electronic profile for a user within a centralized database (an electronic user profile is created by profile system 14 (Col. 3, Lines 1-2) within the profile system **as a centralized database** (Col. 2, Lines 50-56));

creating an electronic profile for data within the centralized database (Access Control List as electronic profile for data within the profile system **as a centralized database** (Col. 3, Lines 4-14));

establishing pre-determined rules and methodology for user access (inferencing rules as **pre-determined rules** and access privileges, e.g., read-only access, as *methodology for user access* are established (Col. 4, Lines 6-13));

making a decision with reference to the user access after completing an evaluation based on the electronic profiles, pre-determined rules, and operating methodology in response to a request from the user for access (As shown in FIG. 3, in order to grant access to a requested object or *making a decision with reference to the user access*, and the procedure is processed as at step 156-158, *in response to a request from the user for access*, to *complete an evaluation based on* inferencing rules to retrieve key words in the user profile and determine access privileges (Col. 4, Lines 6-11) for comparing with access privileges in ACL (Col. 4, Lines 22-26) as *the electronic profiles, pre-determined rules, and operating methodology* (Col. 4, Lines 25-31));

Art Unit: 2168

if the user is denied access, prompting the user to complete the request for quick approval wherein the request for quick approval includes a list of data for approval (Referring back to Kraenzel FIG. 3, user privilege is determined again at box 156, *if the user is denied access* indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests *prompting the user to complete the request for additional privileges as quick approval is implied* at this box. As disclosed at Col. 2, Lines 12-15 and Col. 4, Lines 22-23, the request for access contains one or more objects requested by a user, and the requested objects are files or documents. Thus, the requested objects contain at least keywords for identifying the request files or documents such as files names. In different words, *a list of data for approval is included in the quick approval request* at box 162);

automatically determining, using an internal exception access process, an approval or a disapproval of quick access based on pre-established criteria and the list of data for approval (The YES and NO branches of box 162 as *an internal exception access process*, which indicate the steps of *automatically determining an approval or a disapproval of quick access*. The determination is based on additional privileges as *pre-established criteria* and the requested objects that contain information for identifying the request files or documents as the *list of data for approval*);

if the request for quick approval is approved, at least one of automatically adding a rule to the database and automatically adding a user to the database (if additional privileges have been granted, ACL is updated (Col. 4, Lines 38-39). User profile is added or updated in accordance with the updated ACL (Col. 3, Lines 3-5));

if the rule is added, updating an exception list (As specified in the conditional statement, either adding a rule or adding a user should be performed. If a user is added, this step is not performed);

notifying the user of the approval (Col. 4, Lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 3, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *creating data profiles based on at least one of Data Elements, Data Tags, Rules of Access, an Approver's Name for Each Rule of Access, Rules of Exclusion, an Exception List, and Field Tags* (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-26).

Regarding claim 4, Kraenzel teaches all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *establishing pre-determined rules in the centralized database based on at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines* (Col. 3, Lines 61-65, inferencing rules as *Rule Based Access guidelines* is established); *and establishing methodology to ensure timely and accurate decision making based on criteria established by the management* (Col. 3, Lines 56-58, access privilege as *methodology* is established. The purpose is to *ensure timely and accurate decision making based on criteria established by the management*).

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches *a method for managing a user profile information* (Kraenzel, Abstract) *including managing access control to applications and data by implementing a level of security across the different applications that is the same for each application* (Kraenzel, Col. 1, Lines 13-26) *using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least one client system* (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system). The Kraenzel method comprises the steps of:

providing capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to (As shown in FIG. 3, after making an object request access at box 152 and if user privilege does not meet minimum requirement for object requested at box 156, additional privilege can be requested and processed by boxes 162-168);

tracking a status of the request using a tracking component coupled to the centralized interactive database (as illustrated at Kraenzel FIG. 3, after making a request access at box 152, *a status of the request*, either YES for retrieving object at box 158 or NO for requesting additional privileges at box 162, Col. 4, Lines 20-35, *is tracked by Access Determining Object 24, Col. 3, Lines 5-7, as a tracking component included in Profile System 14. Access Determining Object 24 is coupled to an ACL as centralized interactive database, Col. 2, Lines 14-16*);

obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested (additional privilege is determined by system administrator to have YES/NO branch, Col. 4, Lines 37-39).

In regard to the limitation *if the user is denied access, prompting the user to complete the request for quick approval wherein the request for quick approval wherein the request for quick approval includes a list of the information the user is requesting access to for approval; automatically determining, using an internal exception access process, an approval or a disapproval of quick access based on pre-established criteria and the list of information the user is requesting access to; if the request for quick approval is approved, at least one of automatically adding a rule to the database and automatically adding a user to the database; if the rule is added, updating an exception list; and notifying the user of the approval*, such limitation has been interpreted as a conditional statement wherein the steps following the conditional statement are only performed when the specified condition has been met. The steps are not performed when the condition has not been met. Therefore, the steps following the conditional statement have been interpreted as being optional. Claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed (MEPE 2111.04).

In this case, when the access request is approved, the process of providing access is stopped after the step of obtaining a decision.

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches *a method for managing a user profile information (Kraenzel, Abstract) including managing access control to applications and data by implementing a level of*

security across the different applications that is the same for each application (Col. 1, Lines 13-26) *using a web-based system that includes a server system coupled to a centralized interactive database and at least one client system* (Col. 1, Lines 13-26, ACL is a centralized interactive database coupled with server/client system). The Kraenzel method comprises the steps of:

providing capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to (As shown in FIG. 3, after making an object request access at box 152 and if user privilege does not meet minimum requirement for object requested at box 156, additional privilege can be requested and processed by boxes 162-168);

tracking a status of the request using a tracking component coupled to the centralized interactive database (as illustrated at Kraenzel FIG. 3, after making a request access at box 152, *a status of the request*, either YES for retrieving object at box 158 or NO for requesting additional privileges at box 162, Col. 4, Lines 20-35, is tracked by Access Determining Object 24, Col. 3, Lines 5-7, as a tracking component included in Profile System 14. Access Determining Object 24 is coupled to an ACL as *centralized interactive database*, Col. 2, Lines 14-16);

obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested (additional privilege is determined by system administrator to have YES/NO branch, Col. 4, Lines 37-39);

Referring back to Kraenzel FIG. 3, user privilege is determined again at box 156, *if the user is denied access* indicating by NO branch of box 156, box 162 determines if the user has requested for additional privileges, a YES and NO requests *prompting the user to complete the request for additional privileges as quick approval* is implied at this box. As disclosed at Col. 2, Lines 12-15 and Col. 4, Lines 22-23, the request for access contains one or more objects requested by a user, and the requested objects are files or documents. Thus, the requested objects contain at least keywords for identifying the request files or documents such as files names. In different

Art Unit: 2168

words, *a list of the information the user is requesting access to for approval is included in the quick approval request* at box 162;

The YES and NO branches of box 162 as *an internal exception access process*, which indicate the steps of *automatically determining an approval or a disapproval of quick access*. The determination is based on additional privileges as *pre-established criteria* and the requested objects that contain information for identifying the request files or documents as the *list of the information the user is requesting access to*;

if the request for quick approval is approved, at least one of automatically adding a rule to the database and automatically adding a user to the database (if additional privileges have been granted, ACL is updated (Col. 4, Lines 38-39). User profile is added or updated in accordance with the updated ACL (Col. 3, Lines 3-5));

if the rule is added, updating an exception list (As specified in the conditional statement, either adding a rule or adding a user should be performed. If a user is added, this step is not performed);

notifying the user of the approval (Col. 4, Lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 6, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *obtaining at least one of an approval decision and a disapproval decision* (Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 7, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *reviewing and auditing the user access* (Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 8, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *creating a consistent security model that includes centralized administration of security of the system and uses single user profile and privilege for accessing different applications* (Col. 3, lines 1-15; Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 9, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *creating user profiles; providing access control to data associated with user profiles; defining permissions based on a user identifier associated with user profiles; and developing a specification for user interfaces* (Col. 3, line 1-Col. 4, line 13).

Regarding claim 10, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step *providing administration of a common security model for access control and event notification* (FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 11, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *updating profiles automatically on at least one of a pre-determined timed interval and a change in organization hierarchy* (Col. 3, lines 33-42).

Regarding claim 13, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *generating access list reports that identify accessible and non-accessible data and restrictions for access* (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 20-26 and Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Art Unit: 2168

Regarding claim 14, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *retrieving information from the centralized database in response to a specific inquiry from an administrator* (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 15, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses *the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet* (Col. 2, Lines 1-3, the network as disclosed by Kraenzel is a network includes either a wide are or local are network).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879], CERN [Administrative Information Services, Oracle HR] and Lillibridge [USP 6,195,698 B1].

Regarding claim 2, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, but fails to disclose the step of *creating an electronic profile based on information available from at least one an OHR Application and an RFCA Application*. CERN teaches an OHR application and Lillibridge teaches an RFCA Application (Lillibridge, Col. 8, lines 35-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Behera method by using information from OHR Application and RFCA Application to build the electronic profile in order to distribute object to a user or a group via IP address.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039].

Regarding claim 12, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the step of *updating profiles automatically when a user transfers departments*. However, as disclosed by Kraenzel, profile system 14 may automatically update a user's profile by periodically checking the ACL of the network. This may be performed on a routine basis, or on a random basis, when requested by a system administrator, or at various other instances. System 14 may also use the above process for updating a user profile by simply adding supplemental information to the user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42). Thus, when a user transfers departments, system administrator updates the

Art Unit: 2168

ACL, and user profile will be updated automatically. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Stockwell method by including the step of updating profiles when a user transfers department in order to control access to a database.

Art Unit: 2168

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


HUNG Q PHAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

August 4, 2006